

OSKAR VON HINÜBER

Notes on the Pāli Tradition in Burma

(Beiträge zur Überlieferungsgeschichte  
des Buddhismus in Birma, I)

Mit einer Vorbemerkung

von

Heinz Bechert



VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT IN GÖTTINGEN

## Vorbemerkung

Von Heinz Bechert

In der Reihe der von der Kommission für buddhistische Studien der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen veranstalteten „Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung“ war als vierte Veranstaltung für Frühjahr 1981 eine Tagung zum Thema „Buddhismus in Birma“ vorgesehen. Die Stiftung Volkswagenwerk genehmigte auf Antrag der Akademie Mittel für die Vorbereitung und Durchführung der Tagung. Sie wurde nach dem Muster der beiden früheren Symposien zu den Themen „Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries“ (veröffentlicht als „Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl., Dritte Folge, Nr. 108, Göttingen 1978) und „Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung“ (ebenda, Nr. 117, Göttingen 1980) vorbereitet, d. h. die Texte der Vorträge oder ausführlichere Zusammenfassungen davon sollten den Teilnehmern vor dem Beginn der Sitzungen zugänglich gemacht werden, um eine ins einzelne gehende Diskussion während des Symposions zu ermöglichen.

Abgesehen von dem in der vorliegenden Veröffentlichung publizierten Beitrag waren folgende Vorträge für die Tagung angemeldet: Dr. Eugène Denis (Bangkok): „Cosmology of Burmese Buddhism and Related Religious Practices found in Burma“; Dr. Klaus Fleischmann (Köln): „Buddhismus und Sozialismus im Birma Ne Wins“; Dr. Emmanuel Guillon (Paris): „Notes sur le Bouddhisme Môn“; Prof. Richard Gombrich (Oxford): „Burmese influences on Sinhalese Buddhism in the 20th century“; Dr. Pamela Gutman (Canberra): „The Mahāyānist Art of the Mahāmuni: Beginnings of Buddhist Kingship in Burma?“; Prof. Otto Karow (Frankfurt): „Der Lotos-Buddha: Herkunft und kultische Bedeutung“; Prof. Siegfried Lienhard (Stockholm): „Zu den Beziehungen zwischen dem nepalesischen und birmanischen Buddhismus“; Dr. Gernot Prunner: „Buddhistische Wandmalereien aus Pagan im Hamburgischen Museum für Völkerkunde“; Prof. Erhard Rosner (Göttingen): „Der Buddhismus in Birma aus chinesischer Sicht“; Dr. Gustav Roth (Göttingen): „Remarks on the Bengali Buddha Biography Baudhdharañjikā and its Relationship with the Arakanese Dhātuvañ“; Prof. Melford Spiro (San Diego): „The Dialectical Relationship between Buddhism and the Nat Cult in Burma“; Prof. Janice Stargardt (Cambridge): „New Archaeological Research on the History of Buddhism in Burma“; U Tin Htway (Heidelberg): „The Vinayadhara Sect of the Pagan Period“. Ferner waren drei Vorträge birmanischer Gelehrter angekündigt, von denen sich je ein Referat mit der älteren Geschichte des birma-



nischen Buddhismus, mit der Geschichte der buddhistischen Literatur Birmas am Beispiel der Paritta-Texte sowie mit der Reform des Sangha nach der Sangha-Konvention im Mai 1980 befassen sollte. Schließlich war ein Bericht von Dr. Heinz Braun (Göttingen) über die Erschließung birmanischer Literaturwerke im Rahmen der Arbeiten am Verzeichnis birmanischer Handschriften in Deutschland geplant.

Leider ergaben sich Ende 1980 unerwartete Schwierigkeiten bei der Entsendung der Teilnehmer aus Birma, die eine termingerechte Vorlage der Texte unmöglich machten. Da außerdem zwei weitere Fachkollegen ihre Teilnahme kurzfristig aus gesundheitlichen Gründen absagen mußten, schien es ratsam, die Tagung zunächst einmal für unbestimmte Zeit zu verschieben.

Nun hatten einige der erwarteten Teilnehmer schon vor diesem Zeitpunkt die Texte ihrer Beiträge ganz oder in Form ausführlicher Zusammenfassungen zur Verfügung gestellt. Von diesen Texten wird hier zunächst der Beitrag von Prof. Oskar von Hinüber (Freiburg) veröffentlicht, der sich mit der Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pāli-Buddhismus in Birma befaßt. Die Pāli-Philologie kann zwar in der westlichen Wissenschaft schon auf eine längere Tradition zurückblicken, doch ist gerade die zentrale Bedeutung Birmas für die Überlieferung der Pāli-Literatur bisher noch nicht hinreichend beachtet worden. Deshalb kommt der hier vorgelegten Untersuchung zur Neubewertung der Rolle der birmanischen Tradition und vor allem des von Helmer Smith herausgegebenen monumentalen Meisterwerks der einheimischen Pāli-Philologie Birmas, nämlich der *Saddanīti* von Aggavaṃsa, für die gesamte Pāli-Tradition grundlegende Bedeutung zu.

Es war zunächst geplant, hier gleichzeitig zwei weitere für das Symposium vorgesehene Beiträge zu veröffentlichen. Da sich jedoch dabei Schwierigkeiten redaktioneller Art ergeben haben, möchte ich die Veröffentlichung des druckfertig vorliegenden Beitrags von Prof. von Hinüber nicht weiter verzögern. Jedoch hoffe ich, daß demnächst als zweiter Text zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Buddhismus in Birma der Aufsatz „Notes sur le Bouddhisme Môn“ von Dr. Emmanuel Guillon publiziert werden kann. Diese Studie gilt der Geschichte des Buddhismus bei den Mon, also bei jenem bedeutenden alten Kulturvolk Südostasiens, dem die Birmanen einen großen Teil ihres kulturellen Erbes verdanken. Bekanntlich sind die reichen Schätze der Mon-Literatur noch weitgehend unerschlossen, und die bedeutenden historischen Stätten der Mon-Kultur, so ihre alte Hauptstadt Thaton, sind noch nicht Gegenstand systematischer archäologischer Forschung gewesen. Die Untersuchungen über den Buddhismus der Mon sind daher für die Erforschung der Religionsgeschichte Südostasiens von größtem Interesse.

Es ist zu hoffen, daß in absehbarer Zeit auch einige weitere der ursprünglich für das Symposium bestimmten Beiträge veröffentlicht werden können und daß die zunächst abgesagte Konferenz zu gegebener Zeit stattfinden wird. Schließlich möchte ich der Stiftung Volkswagenwerk noch für die Förderung des Vorhabens danken.

## Notes on the Pāli Tradition in Burma\*

by Oskar von Hinüber

The prominent position of Burmese scholars in the field of Pāli studies is well known for centuries. In the very recent past this has been documented by the monumental text editions prepared on the occasions of the 5th and 6th councils held in Burma in 1871 and 1956 respectively. Especially the Chaṭṭhasaṃgāyana edition (ChS) comprising the whole Tipiṭaka accompanied by its commentaries (*aṭṭhakathā*) and subcommentaries (*ṭīkā*) together with the Visuddhimagga and the Visuddhimaggamahāṭīkā in altogether 117 volumes reaches a very high standard sometimes superior to any other printed edition. In spite of these well known facts, the history of the Pāli tradition in Burma has hardly been investigated, although its influence on the Pāli texts as we read them today has been considerable.

These texts were handed down in those countries, where Theravāda Buddhism prevails. They are generally and correctly believed to rest almost entirely on the tradition as preserved in Ceylon and here again first of all in the Mahāvihāra.<sup>1</sup> Therefore it has been emphasized time and again that, whenever a relatively uncontaminated Sinhalese tradition can be found, a rather old and conservative form of that particular text survives. Unfortunately the number of such texts, which may be classified as being based on an authentic Sinhalese tradition is rather limited. Well known examples are the famous Copenhagen Jātaka-manuscript C<sup>k2</sup> or the Sinhalese manuscripts preserved in Copenhagen and London used by L. Feer for his edition of the Saṃyuttanikāya.<sup>3</sup>

---

\* Abbreviations follow the system laid down in the Epilegomena to the Critical Pāli Dictionary, if not stated otherwise.

<sup>1</sup> It is not clear, how the well known Vinaya fragment found in Nepal fits into this picture, as it may well be a remainder of "continental" Pāli.—Attention to this fragment was drawn by C. Bendall: Note on the history of the Pāli canon in Northern India. In: Verhandlungen des XIII. Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses. Hamburg 1902. Leiden 1904. 58–60, and it has been edited by P. V. Bapat: A Pāli manuscript in an Indian script. ABORI 33. 1952. 197–210.

<sup>2</sup> H. Smith in H. Bechert: Zur Geschichte der buddhistischen Sekten in Indien und Ceylon. In: La Nouvelle Clio. VII–VIII–IX (Mélanges C. Courtois et W. Marçais). 1955–1957. p. 347 and C. E. Godakumbura: Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts. Copenhagen 1980 (Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts, Xylographs etc. in Danish Collections. Vol. I). p. 33.

<sup>3</sup> There is a manuscript dated AD 1412 in the Colombo Museum: W. A. de Silva: Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum. Vol. I. Colombo 1938 (Memoirs of the Colombo Museum. Series A. No. 4) No. 70.



Mostly, however, the text tradition is Burmese rather than directly dependent on Sinhalese manuscripts<sup>4</sup> on historical reasons that need not be repeated here.<sup>5</sup> Other local traditions<sup>6</sup> such as Thai, Laotian and Cambodian<sup>7</sup> are generally assumed to be secondary to the Burmese, although very little is actually known about manuscripts from Laos and Cambodia. As far as Thailand is concerned, occasional very good variants in some texts, superior to both the Sinhalese and Burmese manuscripts may point to a rather old tradition especially in the North. It remains an open question, however, whether or not there might be any connection with the Thai redaction of the Theravāda canon prepared under king Tilaka in Wat Ched Yod at Chiang Mai during the late 15th century on the occasion of the 8th council in Thai reckoning.

Returning to the Burmese tradition, it may be said that ever since king Kyan-zittha (1086–1112) took the pains to “collect and purify the Tipiṭaka, which had become obscured and corrupt”<sup>8</sup> a highly sophisticated Pāli philology developed in Burma during the following centuries, which has left traces in almost every text. This vigorous, rigorous and bold scholarship never shrank back from introducing sometimes quite considerable alterations in the wording even of the Tipiṭaka. Therefore anybody studying Pāli, whether working on manuscripts, grammar or literary history, has to acquaint himself with the ways and means by which Pāli was moulded in Burma. These can be neither understood nor evaluated without a thorough knowledge of the Saddanīti, their very foundation and in many respects their culmination, too.

The importance of Aggavaṃsa’s work, now easily accessible in Helmer Smith’s excellent edition, furnished with rich appendices and indices, is underlined by the fact that it is impossible even today to bypass the Saddanīti when doing research on any grammatical problem in Pāli.

<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately most European editors cared very little to find out the local tradition of their respective texts, with rare exceptions such as R. Pischel, who was able to trace the Burmese origin of all his Therīgāthā manuscripts (Thī p. 120); the Suttanipāta and the Apadāna are also based on a Burmese tradition: H. Bechert: Bruchstücke buddhistischer Verssammlungen I: Die Anavataptagāthā und die Sthaviragāthā. (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden VI.) Berlin 1961. p. 73. The same seems to hold good for the Vinaya, too: O. v. Hinüber: Pāli *kaṭṭhāṭṭhi*. IJ 21. 1979. p. 25 note 9.

<sup>5</sup> G. H. Luce: The advent of Buddhism to Burma. In: Buddhist Studies in Honour of I. B. Horner, Dordrecht 1974. 119–138; W. M. Sirisena: Sri Lanka and South-East Asia. Leiden 1978, and H. Bechert (as note 2 above) p. 344 foll.

<sup>6</sup> A survey of the different traditions has been given by F. R. Hamm: Zu einigen neueren Ausgaben des Pāli-Tipiṭaka. ZDMG 112. 1962. 353–378 and W. B. Bollée: Kuṇāla-jātaka. London 1970. p. IX foll. The Mon tradition has been evaluated by P. Dupont in his introduction to: La version mōne du Nārada-Jātaka. Saigon 1954 (PEFEO XXXVI), cf. G. Cœdès (as note 10 below) p. 288 foll.

<sup>7</sup> G. Cœdès: Catalogue des manuscrits en Pāli, Laotien et Siamois provenant de la Thaïlande. Copenhagen 1966 (Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts, Xylographs etc. in Danish Collections. Vol. II, 2). Introduction.

<sup>8</sup> G. H. Luce: Old Burma—Early Pagān. New York 1969. Vol. I p. 61.

The very high value of this grammar has not been and could not be understood in full in Europe before Helmer Smith's edition appeared. As the Saddanīti was known to R. O. Franke in part only, he acknowledges its qualities only hesitatingly.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, it was a particular unlucky coincidence that the Saddanīti was not yet available to Geiger when he wrote his "Pāli. Literature and Language" in 1916, which is still fundamental though in urgent need of revision. For many forms of rare occurrence though listed in the Saddanīti escaped Geiger's notice, and are not found in his grammar consequently.

The rare scholarly achievements of Aggavaṃsa, who wrote his grammar in 1154 only about hundred years after the introduction of Theravāda Buddhism and Pāli into Burma and about fifty years before the influence from Ceylon raise to prominence,<sup>10</sup> together with its comprehensiveness may explain its heavy influence on the Burmese Pāli tradition, so much so that Helmer Smith observed "c'est donc dans la conviction que notre pali est une fonction de celui du 12ème siècle . . . que j'ai entrepris l'étude de la norme palie enseignée par Aggavaṃsa".<sup>11</sup> Numerous examples justifying this statement have been collected by Helmer Smith himself in his copious notes to the Saddanīti. Here a few instances will be discussed, which do not only have some bearing on the actual wording of the texts thus proving the importance of the Saddanīti as a parallel tradition to the manuscripts but which show at the same time, on which line the grammatical discussion about Pāli influenced the development of this language, which is much less a "dead" one than generally assumed, but rather an artificial language shaped and reshaped again and again.<sup>12</sup>

In the Chaṭṭhasaṃgāyana edition the following verse is found without any variant noted by the editors:

*tapo idha krubbasi brahmapattiyā*, S I 181,10\*

In reading *krubbasi*, of which there is no trace found neither in the Sinhalese nor in the Burmese manuscripts used by L. Feer for Ee, the ChS clearly follows Sadd 510,16\* = 835,6\*, where this verse is quoted in the same wording as given above. This shows, how even in the very recent past old and correct readings can be superseded by new and artificial ones. For the peculiar *krubbati* does not fit into the phonetic pattern of Pāli, where there should not be a cluster *kr-*. Therefore this word occurring occasionally in the Burmese tradition remains

<sup>9</sup> R. O. Franke: Geschichte und Kritik der Pāli-Grammatik und -Lexikographie. Straßburg 1902. p.47foll. (= Kleine Schriften. Wiesbaden 1978. I. p. 59foll.); cf. also M. Bode: Early Pāli Grammarians in Burma. JPTS 1908. 81-101.

<sup>10</sup> G. Cœdès: Les états hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie. Paris 1964. p. 274foll.

<sup>11</sup> Saddanīti. La grammaire palie d'Aggavaṃsa. Text établi par Helmer Smith. Lund 1928-1966. Avant-propos. p. VI.

<sup>12</sup> For details see: O. v. Hinüber: Pāli as an artificial language. Indologica Taurinensia X. 1982. 133-140.



inexplained and inexplicable within the given frame of the phonetic laws operating in Pāli. Yet two further examples are found in the Saddanīti:

*pharusāhi vācāhi pakrubbamāno*, Ja IV 47,12\* = Sadd 510,16\*

and:

*aphalā hoti akrubbato*, DhP 51 = Th 323 = Sadd 516,29\*

In neither of these passages any editor including ChS follows the Saddanīti, nor does there seem to be any trace of *kru-* in the manuscripts or even in the non-Pāli parallels to this verse: *akuvadu*, Gāndhārī-Dharmapada 290 and *akurvato*, Patna-Dharmapada 125, where *akrubbato* moreover destroys the cadence.

The Pāli-Burmese Dictionary<sup>13</sup> further quotes from the ChS:

*tādisaṃ mittam krubbetha*, Vin II 203,19\* = It 87,3\*

where the variant *kubbetha* from *sī* (Sinhalese) and *syā* (Thai) is noted which is indeed the form common to the manuscript tradition as reflected in the Vinaya editions. In the parallel passage in the Itivuttaka on the contrary ChS reads *kubbetha* although all Burmese manuscripts used for Ee have *krubbetha*, a fairly recent reading here, too, as it is neither shared by It-a II 102,8 nor by Sp-ṭ Be 1956 III 420,9, where the commentary on the Itivuttaka is quoted. Similarly:

*sabbhi kubbetha santhavam*, S I 17,3\*

where the variant *krubbetha* is recorded as Burmese in Ee and as *ka* ("in some books") in ChS.

This evidence gathered from modern editions is very useful to understand how variants can intrude into the texts. Exactly as the *bhāṇakas*<sup>14</sup> in ancient times influenced the wording of their respective texts of course only in those parts of the canonical or commentarial scriptures they used to recite and to know by heart, different groups of monks concentrated on different texts during the 6th council when preparing ChS. This explains, why the Saṃyuttanikāya follows the Saddanīti, while on the other hand the Jātaka and the Dhammapada do not. By going back further to an earlier period as for instance to those times, when the *ṭīkā*s were composed, one might imagine easily how an influential redaction of any text can become the archetype of the whole tradition, as the ChS edition certainly will in Burma. This means that some time in future a text is to be expected having *krubbati* only and leaving grammarians puzzled as to the origin of this strange form.

Luckily the variants *krubbati* etc. are all fairly young as demonstrated above, and their occurrence is limited. As the Saddanīti not only quotes passages with

<sup>13</sup> Tipiṭaka Pāli-mraṇmā Abhidhān. I-X (a-d) Rangoon 1963-1980 (Vol. IV, 2 *utth-o* is in the press).

<sup>14</sup> E. W. Adikaram: Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon. Colombo 1946. 24-32 and H. Lüders: Bharhut und die buddhistische Literatur. Leipzig 1941 (repr. 1966). p. 175 foll.

this form, but explicitly teaches *krubbati*, there seems to be a fair chance to trace its origin by investigating into the discussion on this word by the Pāli grammarians. In the oldest Pāli grammar known no trace is found of the initial cluster *kr-*.<sup>15</sup> The Saddanīti on the other hand allows both, *k-* and *kr-*: *ku kru c'ossa vattaṃ sabbattha*, Sadd 835,3(1026) “the *o* in *ku* and *kru* can always become *v*”. Thus after developing *karoti*, *kurute*, and *kubbati* (1025), the form *krubbati* is also taught as interchangeable with *kubbati*. The cluster *kr-* is introduced by Moggallāna, too, and perhaps even a little earlier than by Aggavaṃsa, but only in connection with *karā ririyo*, Mogg V 51(52), where the commentary (Mogg-v) furnishes the additional information: *kathaṃ kriyā ti? kriyāyan ti nipātanā* “why *kriyā*? because it occurs in *kriyāyaṃ* (Mogg V 61 (62)).” Here Moggallāna vindicates *kriyā* on account of a formulation evidently taken over from Sanskrit<sup>16</sup> to which Aggavaṃsa would agree. After asserting *kiriya* as the form proper to Pāli he continues: *kriyā ti padaṃ sakkaṭabhāsāto nayaṃ gahetvā vuttavacanaṃ pāvacane adassanato*, Sadd 923,19foll. “the word *kriyā* is taught in this phonetic shape (*vacana*: Sadd 6.0.3) in taking over a rule from Sanskrit because it does not occur in the tradition (of Pāli).” In a second passage he continues this line of argument: *akkharacintakā pana kriyā icc api padam icchanti ettha kriyāsaddo kiñcā pi* “*aphalā hoti akrubbato*” *ti ādisu kakāra-rakārasaṃyogavantāni padāni dissanti tathā pi klesasaddo viya pāliyaṃ na dissanti; adissamāno pi so atthakathācariyādīhi garūhi gahitattā gahetabbo va*, Sadd 516,28–517,1 “but the grammarians also postulate the word *kriyā*. Here, the stem *kriyā*, however, does not occur in the holy text as the stem *klesa* does, although there are words showing the cluster *kr-* such as *aphalā hoti akrubbato* (Dhp 51). Although it does not occur, it must be accepted because it was accepted by the authorities such as the teachers of the commentaries and others.” This statement is of special importance as it is said here explicitly that grammarians taking Sanskrit as a model introduced Sanskritic forms into Pāli at a rather late date of the text transmission. Aggavaṃsa accepts one of these Sanskritisms as he had a text tradition evidently showing corresponding forms. In different contexts, however, he fights and rejects Sanskritisms such as *ladhvā* for *laddhā*: *taṃ hi sakkaṭaganthe kapaṭapariyāyabhāvena vañcitehi vidūhi icchitaṃ*, Sadd 483,9foll. “this (*ladhvā*) is postulated by scholars deceived by their familiarity with Sanskrit books.” This shows that the pressure of Sanskrit was weighing heavily on Pāli during the times of Aggavaṃsa, and *kriyā* was among the results of this influence exercised by Sanskrit.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup> The relevant *sūtra*: *karato ririyo*, Kacc VII 2,5 = 556 does not yet have *kriyā* found in later grammars.

<sup>16</sup> On the very close relation between Moggallāna and the Cāndravyākaraṇa see R. O. Franke: Moggallāna's Saddalakkhaṇa und das Cāndra-Vyākaraṇa. JPTS 1902–1903. 70–95 (= Kleine Schriften. Wiesbaden 1978. 291–316).

<sup>17</sup> In contrast to Pāli there is no such mixture of languages found in Prakrit. Although the Prakrit grammarians used Sanskrit, they kept the language described and the one used in the



While the origin of *kriyā* can be traced, it does not seem to be easy at all to make any sensible suggestion about the possible development leading to *krub-bati*. The situation is further complicated by the discussion on *krubbati* or rather *krabbati* in the *Rūpasiddhi*, which belongs to the same tradition as the *Saddanīti*:<sup>18</sup> *attanopade kayirātha dhiro kubbetha karetha vā “kvaci dhātū” ti ādinā kussa kru ca: krubbetha krubberam krubbetho krubbeyyāvho krubbeyyam krubbeyyāmhe*, Rūp 522 “. . . because of *kvaci dhātu* (Rūp 488) etc. *ku* may also become *kru* . . .”. The Sinhalese text tradition, however, deviates considerably from this wording, as the Sinhalese variant given in the Burmese edition of 1976 shows: . . . *krabbetha vā kvaci dhātū ti ādinā kussa kra ca: kubberam* . . . . Further, Grünwedel’s text in “Das sechste Kapitel der *Rūpasiddhi* nach drei singhalesischen Handschriften” (Berlin 1883) p. 38.12 reads: *kub-betha kribbetha vā kvaci dhātū ti ādinā kussa kri ca kubberam* . . ., where two of the three manuscripts used by Grünwedel have *krabbetha* and one *kub-betha* for *kribbetha*, which is thus proved to be a hardly correct emendation by Grünwedel because of *kussa kri ca kubberam*. By the help of the variant given in Be 1976 the correct Sinhalese text can be inferred as *kussa kra ca: krabberam*. As *kubbetha* has been taught already, it is clearly *krabbetha* that has to be justified by the general rule *kv ci dhātu* applied to all sorts of exceptions. Moreover after *krussa kri ca* as Grünwedel reads, the example *kubberam* does not make much sense especially as normally after the rule *kvaci dhātu* the relevant exceptions are quoted, e.g. Grünwedel p. 36.5 foll.

If on the other hand *kussa kra ca* is the correct and original text, why then does the Burmese tradition read *kussa kru ca*? A second glance at the Sinhalese manuscripts of Grünwedel’s edition shows that the vacillation between *krabbetha* and *kubbetha* can be due to a misreading of *kra* as *ku*. Although this would not be possible in the contemporary Sinhalese script, where *ku* (කු) and *kra* (ක) are well distinguished from each other and cannot be mixed up easily, this does not seem to have been so during an earlier stage of the development of the Sinhalese script as for instance the Sinhalese variants *atuja* for *atraja*, or *adrabhaka* for *adūbhaka* (s. CPD s.vv.) and the origin of *grīyati* indicate: This verb quoted by Sadd 923,21 from Sn 940 developed artificially: *anugīyanti*, Sn 940 was misspelled as *\*anaguīyanti* and then wrongly interpreted as *anagrīyanti* as the Sinhalese variant *anagriyanti*, Nidd I 420,12 = Sn 940 shows. A restituted preverb *anu-* finally lead to *(anu)grīyati*. Today such a development

---

description well apart. The idea to Pālisize the Sanskrit grammars may have given a new impulse to an old tendency towards Sanskritisation in Pāli (see note 12 above). In later times the collision between the Sanskrit tradition first of all of the Khmers and Pāli in South East Asia as witnessed e.g. in Sukhothai inscriptions may have brought some more Sanskrit into Pāli.

<sup>18</sup> On the relation of *Rūpasiddhi* and *Saddanīti* see R. O. Franke (as note 9 above) p. 25 foll. = 37 foll.



is not possible as the *akṣaras ku, gu, tu* and *kra, gra, tra* follow the same pattern of writing leaving no room for any doubt about the correct reading.

At an earlier stage, however, at a date well before Aggavaṃsa, who already knew and quotes *krubbati* as *pālinayadassanato*, Sadd 510,12, a confusion between *kru* and *kra* was possible. Therefore it does not seem to be too far fetched to assume a misinterpretation of *kubbati* as *krabbati*, which again was blended with *kubbati* resulting in *krubbati*. This process seems to have been repeating itself leading to the Burmese text of the Rūpasiddhi 522 as quoted above.

Quite a few "Burmese" Pāli words own their origin to a similar combination of misreading and blending of different forms, which was moreover favoured by grammatical speculations. In the same way as *krubbati* has been created, *uddiyati* < *uddīryate* was transformed into *undriyati*. This word, too, was accepted by the ChS in the sentence *paṭhavī maññe undriyati*, SI 113,15 (with Spk I 178,15 and Spk-ṭ Be 1956 I 211,18) banishing any other variant from this passage in spite of the uniform and consistent Sinhalese reading *udriyati*.<sup>19</sup> Here neither Aggavaṃsa nor Moggallāna can be relied on as authorities accepting *undriyati*, for this word is alien to both grammars. It is, however, the 19th century Burmese scholar Ledi Sayadaw, who teaches *undriyati* in his *Nirut-tidipani* (*sūtra* 45, p. 35 in Be 1970). Both these words, *krubbati* and *undriyati* together with further examples<sup>20</sup> amply demonstrate, how artificial forms were not only created by grammarians, but that they were introduced into the texts superseding an older and better tradition.

The Saddanīti, however, does not only attest this occasionally rather far reaching spirit of innovation. For many archaic forms sometimes even lost in the rest of the manuscript tradition are preserved in grammatical literature.

Thus the treatment of *vivaṭacchaddā* as an *n*-stem supports the recently debated traditional explanation of this word as *\*vivṛtachadman*.<sup>21</sup> More important, however, is the following statement: *katthaci pana pālīpaddese tiṇisad-dassa nikāralopo pi bhavati dve vā ti vā udakaphusitānī ti*, Sadd 287,23-25 "in some passages of the canonical texts *ni* is dropped in the word *tīṇi* such as 'two or three drops of water'" referring to S II 135,3 = 137,2 = 137,11 and to Vin IV 119,23, where there is no trace of *ti* in the Sinhalese tradition, and in the Vinaya *ti* does not occur in any Burmese manuscript either. In the ChS *ti* finally disappeared altogether. This shows that the monks revising the Saṃyut-

<sup>19</sup> O. v. Hinüber: Bemerkungen zum Critical Pāli Dictionary II. KZ 94. 1980. p. 25 foll. — Additional evidence on the origin of *undriyati* is found in *paṭhaviudriyanasaddo*, Ja I 72,1 (Thus Ee; C<sup>k</sup>: *-udāya-* read *-udraya-* because of *dukkhudraya*; C<sup>s</sup>, Ce 1920, Ce 1926 [SHB]: *-udriya-*; Be 1956: *-undriya-*) and *paṭhaviudriyanasaddasaddiso*, Ja I 74,17 (variants as on Ja I 72,1, but here C<sup>k</sup>: *-udriyana-*).

<sup>20</sup> Similarly *kudhita*: O. v. Hinüber: Pāli *kaṭhati*. IJ 21. 1979. p. 24.

<sup>21</sup> O. v. Hinüber: Die Entwicklung der Lautgruppen *-tm-*, *-dm-* und *-sm-* im Mittel- und Neu-Indischen. MSS 40. 1981. p. 61-71, esp. p. 62 foll.



tanikāya did not always follow the grammatical guidelines as laid down in the Saddanīti, and in this particular case they even overlooked the very clear statement of the *ṭikā*: *pāliyaṃ vibhattilopena niddeso ti tam atthaṃ dassento āha tīṇi vā ti āha*, Spk-ṭ Be 1956 II 128,4 foll. on *dve vā ti vā ti dve vā tīṇi vā*, Spk II 130,4 on S II 135,3. As the *aṭṭhakathā* has *ti* here even in the ChS, this again throws light on the distribution of the texts to certain groups of redactors without too much coordination practised as it seems.<sup>22</sup>

The numeral *ti* is to be connected to the Vedic numeral *trī* and to Aśoka (Rock Edict I H in Girnar) *tī* (AiGr. III 346 § 177 a note). As both words have *-ī*, which is historically justified, the Pāli word also should be read as *tī*. Besides the considerable uncertainty in our tradition concerning *i/ī* and *u/ū*, the extremely rare *tī* in *vā tī* was almost certainly misunderstood by scribes as *vā ti*: *vā iti*. On the other hand *tīṇi* in the Sinhalese manuscripts of the Saṃyuttanikāya and *tīṇi* in the Vinaya also favour an original reading *tī*, which could be enlarged more by *ṇi* easily than *ti*.

The reading occurring throughout in the Sinhalese manuscripts of the Saṃyuttanikāya hints at a date later than the *ṭikā* on the Sāratthappakāsinī (10th century AD?<sup>23</sup>) for the archetype of this tradition. In Burma on the other hand *tī* has been kept alive by the authority of the Saddanīti. In the light of this evidence it is somewhat astonishing that no trace of *tī* survived in the Vinayapiṭaka, which seems to be based entirely on a Burmese tradition.<sup>24</sup> Here again the well known system of the *bhāṇakas* resulted in differing wordings in parallel passages.<sup>25</sup> The rather recent splitting in the tradition of the sentence *dve vā tī* (or: *tīṇi*) *vā* ... points to the fact that the Saṃyuttanikāya followed the Saddanīti while the *vinaya-bhāṇakas* did not.<sup>26</sup>

Whereas the archaic numeral *tī* is attested, however weakly, in the manuscripts the historical Middle Indic form of the numeral 12 *bārasa* does not seem to have left any trace except in grammatical literature as *dvādasa* prevails throughout in the text tradition.<sup>27</sup> This evidence becomes still more bewildering as

<sup>22</sup> The procedure of this council is described in the Nidānakathā to ChS, cf. F. R. Hamm (as note 6 above) p. 375, §§ 21 foll.

<sup>23</sup> L. S. Cousins: Review of Sv-ṭ (Ee) in: Religion 2. 1972. 159–165, esp. 163.

<sup>24</sup> O. v. Hinüber (as note 4 above).

<sup>25</sup> O. v. Hinüber: On the Tradition of Pāli Texts in India, Ceylon and Burma. In: Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Phil.-Hist. Klasse. Dritte Folge 108. 1978. p. 54 note 27, and note 14 above.

<sup>26</sup> It is still an open question well deserving investigation, whether or not, and if, to what extent certain grammarians influenced the tradition or the scribes of single manuscripts of different texts.

<sup>27</sup> There is no reference to *bārasa* in the PED nor in the index to the Saddanīti other than to grammatical literature. The references given in the Pāli Tipiṭakasaddānukkaṃanikā I (Pāli Grantha-Mālā 4). Benares 1979 are the headlines in Ne introduced by modern editors.

Kaccāyana, the oldest surviving grammar of Pali, seems to teach *bārasa*, as *dvādasa* which is equally accepted later on by Moggallāna and Aggavamsa probably occurs in the much later Kaccāyanavutti only.<sup>28</sup> If this interpretation is accepted as correct the numeral *bārasa* disappeared from the manuscripts during the second half of the first millennium AD to be replaced by the Sanskritism *dvādasa*. Similarly *pañcadasa* supplants the historical form *pañnarasa*, although not as completely as *dvādasa* does, as can be seen from the Pali Tipiṭaka Concordance.

But it is by no means only in the sphere of numerals that the grammarians preserve historical forms not met with in the manuscripts. As noticed in the CPD s.v. *āruhati*, the verse:

*sā Maddi nāgam ārūhi*,<sup>29</sup> Ja VI 591,6\*

is quoted as:

*sā Maddi nāgam ārukkhi*, Sadd 161,20\*

The aorist *ārukkhi* cannot be derived palaeographically or as a simple misunderstanding from *ārūhi* confirmed by the Sinhalese manuscripts C<sup>k</sup> and C<sup>8</sup> and later by ChS. On the other hand *ārukkhi* is a genuine historical aorist form. This, however, contradicts the prevailing opinion that the Burmese tradition of the Jātaka has been subject to numerous conjectures and modernizations whereas C<sup>k</sup> represents a conservative text.

This can be seen for instance in *haritupatta* (~ Skt. *haritopākta*), Ja I 50,25; 399,15 in C<sup>k</sup>, converted into the *lectio facilior haritupalitta* in ChS and at Ja I 50,25 also in C<sup>v</sup> which therefore must be of Burmese origin;<sup>30</sup> or: *sace tvam* ... *nābhavissa* ... *apāpessaṃ*, Ja II 11,18 against *na bhavissasi* ... *pāpeyyuṃ* in B<sup>1</sup>; or: *vattham gahetvā thitam Pabhāvatim* ... *dasseti*, Ja V 292,1 "he shows Pabhāvatī standing and having caught her clothes" against *vatthum* in B<sup>d</sup> "he shows ... having caught the standing Pabhāvatī as his subject," which offers an easier construction of the absolutive. In both passages ChS agrees with Ee giving, however, *vatthum* as a variant from *ka*. In the same way the aorist in:

*sa Puṇṇako Vepullam ābhirucchi*, Ja VI 272,5\*

<sup>28</sup> *bārasa* is developed according to Kacc 382, 383 and *dvādasa* can be deduced from Kacc 385 (cf. Kacc-v on Kacc 573). The *sūtra* 385, however, is suspect of being an interpolation as pointed out by E. Senart in his edition. Even if original, the formulation *dv-ekātthānam* could easily be an enlargement of an original *ekā-* which was made at a time when *dvādasa* was accepted.—On the date of Kacc-v: R. O. Franke (as note 9 above) p. 20 (32) foll.

<sup>29</sup> Ee *ārūhi* is a misspelling as stated in CPD I s.v. *abhirūhati* overlooked by CPD II s.v. *abhirūhati* (so read).

<sup>30</sup> Cf. CPD s.v. *upatta*.



is changed to *ābhirūhi* in B<sup>d</sup> and in ChS. The aorist *ābhirucchi* found in C<sup>ks</sup> is confirmed by Moggallāna's grammar, who teaches *abhirucchi*, Mogg VI 34 together with *akocchi*, which is found also in *kudhasmād icchi*, Kacc 500. These aorists, *ārukṣhi*, *ābhirucchi* and *akocchi* are built upon the *sa*-aorist:<sup>31</sup> *ārukṣat*, *abhyarukṣat*<sup>32</sup> or rather *\*abhyarutsat* derived from *rudh* (RV!) rather than *ruh*, and *akrukṣat*, where the development *-kṣ-* into *-kkh-* is due to the preceding *-k-*.<sup>33</sup> Only *akkocchi*, Dhp 3 (and parallels) is found in the Saddanīti 833,5–6, which, however, ignores *abhirucchi* in the same way the whole Burmese tradition does, showing once again a close connection between the grammarians and the manuscript tradition.

The reason why Aggavaṃsa could quote *ārukṣhi* alien to the Sinhalese Jātaka-manuscripts and also contrasting with *-rucchi* of the Sinhalese grammarians, still needs explanation.

In the first place it should be emphasized that this is by no means the only verse from the Jātaka, in which the wording quoted by Aggavaṃsa differs from the Sinhalese tradition:

*kumbhaṃ pañjaliṃ kayirā vāyasaṃ vā padakkhiṇaṃ*, Ja VI 298,6\*

against:

*kumbhimhi pañjaliṃ kuyirā cātañ cāpi padakkhiṇaṃ*, Sadd 514,29\*

with the explanation: *tattha kumbhimhi pi añjalin ti chedo*. Here first of all *kuyirā*, a form never appearing in any printed edition, should be explained: Ee has *kayirā* in spite of C<sup>k</sup> *kuriyā* here and C<sup>ks</sup> *kuriyā*, Ja VI 298,12' in the commentary. The optative *kuriyā* derived directly from *kuryāt* is found once again in a second *gāthā*:

*ko taṃ subhikkhaṃ dirasaññu kuriyā*, Ja VI 206,12\*

Here again *kuriyā* occurs in the *pratika* Ja VI 209,15' in C<sup>ks</sup>. In the text of the *gāthā* both Sinhalese manuscripts have *kiriya* and B<sup>d</sup> *kāriyā* with a long *-ā-* in an attempt to preserve or to restore the cadence. The metrical value of *kuriyā* -- favours a text *kuyirā* in this *gāthā* and at Ja VI 298,6\*, where Ee has suppressed *-hi* though found in C<sup>ks</sup> and now supported by the Saddanīti in the word *kum-*

<sup>31</sup> This has been recognized by C. Caillat, IF 74. 1969. p. 225 and Geiger § 164, who erroneously reconstructs *\*akraukṣit* etc., has to be corrected accordingly. The same applies for the CPD s.v. *āruhati*: *ārukṣhi* < *\*ārukṣi*(!). A further example of the *sa*-aorist is *pāvekkhi* < *prāvīkṣat* and *ajjhupāvekkhi*, CPD s.v. The vowel grade *-o/-e-* may continue a late Vedic development: J. Narten: Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda. Wiesbaden 1964. p. 21.

<sup>32</sup> CPD: "metr. *ābhi-ro*": perhaps rather a "reconstruction" of the obscured *\*abbharucchi* on the basis of the present with compensatory vowel-lengthening.

<sup>33</sup> H. Berger: Zwei Probleme der mittelindischen Lautlehre. München 1955. p. 74.

*bhambi* to restore an apparently faulty metre.<sup>34</sup> Thus both *kuyirā* and *kayirā* are counted as — in metrics,<sup>35</sup> and consequently both are to be read as *kūrā* and *kārā*. That -y- after -r- brings about umlaut is evident from the -e- in *āścarya*: *acchariya* — and *acchera* —; *ācāriya*: *ācera*; *issariya*: *issera* etc. (cf. Sadd p. 1283 s.v. *e*). Originally this umlaut was perhaps phonetically different from -e- and consequently an attempt was made to distinguish these sounds from each other by introducing the orthography -ayi-. Especially *arya*: *ayira* is found not only in Pāli but also in the Patna Dharmapada and occasionally in South Indian inscriptions.<sup>36</sup> But this attempt ended abortive soon, as -ayi- came into use for writing -e-, too:

*appassa kammassa phalaṃ mama-y-idam*, Ja III 450,21\*

where *mamedam* (v—) for *mama-y-idam* is required by the cadence.<sup>37</sup> Only in *kuyirā* an *u*-umlaut is found and preserved thus by the Saddanīti in a Jātaka-verse, where the wording deviates from C<sup>k</sup> in other details also: *cātañ cāpi* for *vayāsaṃ vā* is again a *lectio difficilior* found in the Saddanīti. The otherwise unrecorded *cāta* should be identical with *cātaka*, the Indian cuckoo.<sup>38</sup> As a simple mistake such as *cātañ ca* for *vāyasaṃ* or vice versa can be ruled out, the wording of this verse in the Saddanīti again points to a line of the Jātaka-tradition different from the one found in C<sup>k</sup>. If so, it is of special importance that *kuyirā* (*kūrā*) is common to both traditions. For this form not listed by Geiger shows that the optative *kayirā* (*kārā*) is a Middle Indic transformation from *kuyirā* analogous to *karoti* rather than a continuation of *\*karyāt* as postulated by Geiger § 47.2.

<sup>34</sup> Without referring to the Saddanīti, L. Alsdorf: Das Jātaka vom weisen Vidhura. WZKSO 15, 1971. p. 41 (= Kleine Schriften. Wiesbaden 1974. p. 398) note 32 suggests: *kumbham pi añjaliṃ kariyā*, and reads *kuriyā*, Ja VI 206,12\* in: Das Bhūridatta-Jātaka, WZKSO 1977. p. 42 verse 139.

<sup>35</sup> L. Alsdorf: Die Āryā-Strophen des Pāli-Kanons. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Geistes- u. Sozialw. Klasse. Jg. 1967. Nr. 4. Wiesbaden 1968. p. 21 note 1, and K. R. Norman: The Elders' Verses I. London 1969. § 51.

<sup>36</sup> G. Roth "the word *ayira* employed otherwise only in Pāli" in: The Language of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins. In: Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung (The language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition). Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Phil.-Hist. Klasse. Dritte Folge. Nr. 117. Göttingen 1980. p. 94 § 6 is not quite correct: *ayira* is found in inscriptions mainly from South Eastern India: *āira* and *ayira* in Amāravatī (Lüders: List Nos. 1276, 1280); *ayirahaṃgha*: *āryasaṃgha* in Nāgārjunakoṇḍa (EI 20, 1929. p. 26).—The same *ā* seems to be intended by Khāravēla in his inscription line 1: *aireṇa*, where the reading is doubtful, or *aira* from Udayagiri (D. C. Sircar: Select Inscriptions. Vol. I. Calcutta 1965. p. 214, 222), and *airassa* (Guntur, 2nd century AD: EI 32. 1957/8. p. 85). This evidence collected from inscriptions furnishes an important link between the "continental" and the "insular" Pāli traditions.

<sup>37</sup> On account of the -ayi-: -e- equivalence it is no longer certain, whether *viheṭṭhayittha* is really older than *viheṭṭhettha*, or whether these forms are merely orthographical variants: O. v. Hinüber: StII 2. 1976. p. 36 foll.—Cf. also Pāli *thera* against Aśoka (Girnar) *thaira* (not *a + i*).

<sup>38</sup> Both birds are considered as being ominous: C. D. Bijalwani: Hindu Omens. Delhi 1977. p. 37, 41.



Returning to the Jātaka-tradition reflected in the Saddanīti a further example may demonstrate again the different and in this particular passage even better text against the manuscript C<sup>k</sup>:

*Ummadantī mayā diṭṭhā āmuttamaṇikuṇḍalā*, Ja V 215,28\*

and

*Ummānantim ahaṃ diṭṭhā āmuttamaṇikuṇḍalām*, Sad 483,13 foll.\*

Ee has *Ummadantī ex coniectura*, but *mayā* in C<sup>k</sup> against *ahaṃ* shows that in spite of the commentary *diṭṭhā ti disvāna*, Ja V 216,31' *diṭṭhā* < *dr̥ṣṭvā* was misunderstood as *diṭṭhā* < *dr̥ṣṭā*.

Rather frequent variations in single words can be observed as for instance *anibbattī*, Ja VI 573,2\* but *anivattī*, Sadd 815,13\* supported in the Laotian Jātaka-manuscript kept in Copenhagen (L<sup>k</sup>).<sup>39</sup> Here the CPD s.v. *anibbatti(n)* quotes a second parallel from Ps IV 169,4 where *anivattī* for *anibbattī* is found also in the Burmese and Thai traditions, and states “perhaps a good conjecture” with reference to *anivattī*. But in the light of the examples adduced above this variant should be judged differently.

Without going into further details of the Jātaka quotations met with in the Saddanīti, which offer quite a rewarding subject for thorough investigation, the following conclusions can be reached at: The Saddanīti knows Jātaka-verses sometimes in a slightly different wording, which may be even more correct and older than the readings of the Copenhagen manuscript C<sup>k</sup> representing an uncontaminated Sinhalese tradition not influenced from Burma as can be gathered among other things from the *sandhis* as taught by Aggavaṃsa compared to those used by the scribe of C<sup>k</sup>:

*lakkhī bhava nivesanaṃ*, Ja V 113,4\*

to be interpreted as a split compound *lakkhī-bhava-nivesanaṃ* according to Helmer Smith note *e* on Sadd 202. The Saddanīti has *lakhyā*, Sadd 202,17 in this verse concurring with B<sup>s</sup> in the Jātaka. Or:

*dassāhaṃ parapesiyā ahuṃ*, Ja III 413,20\*

with an old Middle Indic *sandhi* against:

*dāsyāham parapesikā ahuṃ*, Sadd 618,2\*

<sup>39</sup> CPD s.vv.—The manuscript L<sup>k</sup> used by the CPD and in the notes to the Saddanīti seems to represent a very good text as e.g. *tattha assaṃ mahesiyā*, Ja VI 483,6\* qu. Sadd 832,24\*, which is a metrically incorrect *ślokapāda* d: —○—○○○—, for, as L. Alsdorf: Les études Jaina. Paris 1965. p. 59 has shown, *mahesi* is scanned ○— as Sanskrit *mahiṣī*. Saddanīti 832 note *e* quotes from L<sup>k</sup> *mahesī piyā* and confers *Kaṇhassa mahesī piyā*, Ja VI 421,20\* —○○○, ○—○—. Therefore the original wording can be inferred perhaps as *tatth' assaṃ mahesī piyā*, Ja VI 483,6\* ———, ○—○—. It does not seem to be impossible that L<sup>k</sup> represents the old North Thai recension mentioned above.

As the evidence shows, C<sup>k</sup> is different and under no influence from Burma. But how can those old and correct readings be explained? The answer to this question can be sought in Burmese history only. It is well known that among those things King Anuruddha obtained by his campaign leading to the occupation of Thaton, there were several sets of the Tipiṭaka either together with or only the Jātaka. Now this Jātaka is known to have been different in many details from the standard Sinhalese Jātaka used in Burma, too, after the revision of the canon during the late 11th century, as for instance the total number of stories was 550 instead of 547 in Ceylon.<sup>40</sup> Therefore it seems to be possible that this recension, probably stemming from Kāñcī, has left traces in the Burmese Jātaka used by Aggavaṃsa. This assumption would account for forms not found in C<sup>k</sup> but in the Saddanīti such as *ārukkihi*. If this conclusion should be confirmed by a more detailed study of the Jātaka-quotations in the Saddanīti,<sup>41</sup> this Jātaka text would be a faint echo of a Jātaka-tradition different from the one transmitted in the Mahāvihāra in Ceylon thus offering a however limited picture of the continental Pāli tradition of South India.<sup>42</sup> For, as in the case of *anivattī/anibbattī* the non-Mahāvihāra form is found in the Thai and Laotian traditions, too, it seems that the reflections of the Burmese-South Indian Jātaka has left traces in the Northern Thai tradition as fixed in the late 15th century. But here a new line of research into the Pāli tradition in South East Asia opens leading to a revaluation of the hardly ever used and certainly underestimated Thai tradition.<sup>43</sup>

The investigation into the history of Pāli texts Burma concentrating especially on *nissayas*<sup>44</sup> and grammars, and in South East Asian in general, which has hardly started at all, will most certainly not only lead to new insights into the literary activities in those countries, but will also yield results for a better understanding of the highly artificial character of Pāli. Thus a substantial improvement of the critical text editions and a better understanding of the history of Pāli could be reached at.

<sup>40</sup> G. H. Luce (as note 8 above) p. 40, and: The 550 Jātakas in Old Burma. *Artibus Asiae* 19. 1956. 291–307; G. Martini: Les titres des Jātaka dans les manuscrits Pāli de la Bibliothèque Nationale à Paris. *BEFEO* 51. 1963. 79–93.

<sup>41</sup> At present it remains a matter of speculation whether or not some of the untraced verses collected Sadd 1017–1024 were drawn from the Burmese-South Indian Jātaka recension.

<sup>42</sup> On the non-Mahāvihāra tradition: H. Bechert (as note 2 above) p. 331 foll. and V. Stache-Rosen: Das Upāliparipṛcchāsūtra. In: *Buddhism in Ceylon* . . . (as note 25 above) p. 58–60.

<sup>43</sup> After completing this article by the end of 1980, I had the opportunity to inspect Thai manuscripts in Bangkok and in Chiang Mai during 1981 and 1982. A first report on the results is going to be published in the *Journal of the Siam Society*: Pāli manuscripts of canonical texts from North Thailand. A preliminary report.

<sup>44</sup> D. Guha: The Burmese *nissayas*—a study. *JOIB* 14. 1956. 252–261 offers no help.— Important information, however, can be gathered on this subject now from the introduction to: H. Bechert-Daw Khin Khin Su-Daw Tin Tin Myint: *Burmese Manuscripts*. Part I. Wiesbaden 1979 (VOHD XXIII, 1).



NACHRICHTEN  
DER AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN IN GÖTTINGEN  
I. PHILOLOGISCH-HISTORISCHE KLASSE

---

Jahrgang 1983

Nr. 3

# Notes on the Pāli Tradition in Burma

(Beiträge zur Überlieferungsgeschichte  
des Buddhismus in Birma, I)

Von

Oskar von Hinüber



---

VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT IN GÖTTINGEN

Ausgegeben März 1983